

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Paul Lippens	CASM116373	CONFIRMATION NO. 8709
09/673,428		12/05/2000			
26389	7590	06/18/2003			
	•	CONNOR, JOHN	EXAMINER		
1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800				SIMONE, CATHERINE A	
SEATTLE,	SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER .
				1772	
				DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003	(4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		4
,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/673,428	LIPPENS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Catherine Simone	1772
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	FION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may tition. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) No statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>March 25, 2003</u> .	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) [2]	This action is non-final.	
Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the appl	ication.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>19-32</u> is/are wi	thdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18 and 33</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Ex		. H F
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		
Applicant may not request that any objectio 11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on	• ,	
If approved, corrected drawings are require		Julsapproved by the Examiner.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by	• •	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	tio Examinor.	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	foreign priority under 35 H S (\$ 119(a) (d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	loreign priority under 55 5.5.t	5. § 113(a)-(d) 51 (1).
1. Certified copies of the priority doci	uments have been received	
2. Certified copies of the priority doci		Application No
3. Copies of the certified copies of th		
application from the Internation * See the attached detailed Office action for	nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for do	omestic priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign langua 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for d	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Attachment(s)	_	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper	948) 5) Notice	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)	ffice Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 14

Application/Control Number: 09/673,428 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 18 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Namikawa et al. (4,849,618).

Namikawa et al. discloses a security element comprising a magnetic layer (Fig. 1, #5 and Fig. 11, M'; also see col. 3, lines 45-61) and an embossed layer (Fig. 1, #3' and Fig. 11, M'), the embossed layer having an embossed pattern of a particular shape producing an optical diffraction effect, characterized in that the magnetic layer is a soft-magnetic layer and wherein at least part of the soft-magnetic layer has the shape of the embossed pattern of the embossed layer (see col. 4, lines 26-30) whereby the embossed layer affects the magnetic properties of the soft-magnetic layer and the effects are detectable externally of the security element. Regarding claim 2, the security element further comprises at least a metal layer with a high specular reflectance (see col. 3, lines 44-48). Regarding claims 3 and 4, the metal layer with a high specular reflectance is aluminum (see col. 3, lines 44-48). Regarding claim 5, note that the security element further comprises an adhesive layer (see col. 4, lines 38-40). Regarding claim 8, the particular shape of the embossed pattern inherently produces a hologram (see col. 9, lines 23-50). Regarding claim 10, the soft magnetic layer comprises an alloy containing cobalt, iron, silicon and boron (see col.

Art Unit: 1772

8, line 68). Regarding **claim 11**, the alloy further comprises Ni (see col. 8, line 66). Regarding **claim 14**, the security element has single soft-magnetic layer (Fig. 1, #5). Regarding **claim 16**, the soft-magnetic layer is a non-work hardened layer (see col. 3, lines 45-61). Regarding **claim 18**, note the effect on the magnetic properties of the soft-magnetic layer is at least a change in coercive force of 10% or a change in relative permeability of at least 10% (see col. 3, lines 3, lines 45-55). Regarding **claim 33**, the thickness of the soft-magnetic layer is in the range of 150-700 nm (see col. 3, lines 50-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namikawa et al. (4,849,618) in view of Chamberlain (5,762,377).

Namikawa et al. discloses a security element comprising a magnetic layer (Fig. 1, #5 and Fig. 11, M') and an embossed layer (Fig. 1, #3' and Fig. 11, M'), the embossed layer having an embossed pattern of a particular shape producing an optical diffraction effect, characterized in that the magnetic layer is a soft-magnetic layer and wherein at least part of the soft-magnetic layer has the shape of the embossed pattern of the embossed layer (see col. 4, lines 26-30) whereby the embossed layer affects the magnetic properties of the soft-magnetic layer and the effects are detectable externally of the security element. However, Namikawa et al. fails to

Application/Control Number: 09/673,428

Art Unit: 1772

disclose the embossed layer comprising an a,b-ethylenically unsaturated carboxylic acid-based resin. Chamberlain teaches it is old and well-known in the analogous art an adhesive layer being an a,b-ethylenically unsaturated carboxylic acid-based resin (see col. 15, lines 60-65) for the purpose of producing a security element with increased protection against counterfeiting.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have the adhesive layer in Namikawa et al. to comprise an a,b-ethylenically unsaturated carboxylic acid-based resin as suggested by Chamberlain in order to produce a security element with increased protection against counterfeiting.

5. Claims 9, 12, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namikawa et al. (4,849,618) in view of Pettigrew et al. (4,960,651).

Namikawa et al. discloses a security element comprising a magnetic layer (Fig. 1, #5 and Fig. 11, M') and an embossed layer (Fig. 1, #3' and Fig. 11, M'), the embossed layer having an embossed pattern of a particular shape producing an optical diffraction effect, characterized in that the magnetic layer is a soft-magnetic layer and wherein at least part of the soft-magnetic layer has the shape of the embossed pattern of the embossed layer (see col. 4, lines 26-30) whereby the embossed layer affects the magnetic properties of the soft-magnetic layer and the effects are detectable externally of the security element. However, Namikawa et al. fails to disclose the soft-magnetic layer comprising an alloy containing cobalt and niobium, together with a glass-forming element and an alloy having a composition Co 35-70, Fe 2-7, Ni 10-35, Mo 0-2, Si 12-20, B 6-12 and the soft-magnetic layer having a coercive force in the range 3 A/m to 500 A/m and being a sputtered layer. Pettigrew et al. teaches it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have a soft-magnetic layer comprising an alloy containing cobalt and niobium,

Application/Control Number: 09/673,428

Art Unit: 1772

together with a glass-forming element (see col. 5, lines 27-28) and an alloy having a composition Co 35-70, Fe 2-7, Ni 10-35, Mo 0-2, Si 12-20, B 6-12 (see col. 6, lines 9-11) and a soft-magnetic layer having a coercive force in the range 3 A/m to 500 A/m (see col. 7, line 25-30) and being a sputtered layer (see col. 5, lines 1-7) for the purpose of producing a security element with low coercivity and high permeability.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have the soft-magnetic layer in Namikawa et al. comprise an alloy containing cobalt and niobium, together with a glass-forming element and an alloy having a composition Co 35-70, Fe 2-7, Ni 10-35, Mo 0-2, Si 12-20, B 6-12 and to have coercive force in the range 3 A/m to 500 A/m and be a sputtered layer as suggested by Pettigrew et al. in order to produce a security element with low coercivity and high permeability.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 and 33 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catherine Simone whose telephone number is (703) 605-4297. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (703) 308-4251. The fax phone numbers for the

Page 6

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Catherine Simone

Examiner

Art Unit 1772

June 6, 2003

HAROLD PYON "
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER